THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. ANANDA REDDY

-

W.P.No. 16887 of 2005

Date: August 8, 2005

Between:

P. Ramalinga Reddy, S/o. P. Lakshmi Reddy,

Aged 36 years, Lecturer in Library Science,

SCRM, Sree Ankala Reddy Memorial Degree College,

Allagadda, Kurnool district.

…Petitioner

and

The Government of Andhra Pradesh,

Rep. by its Principal Secretary to

Higher Education, Secretariat, Hyderabad

And two others.

…Respondents

* * *

O R D E R:

-

This Writ Petition is filed by the petitioner aggrieved by the inaction of the respondents in regularising his services as Lecturer in Library Science in the 3rd respondent College.

2. According to the petitioner, he passed M.A. (Public Administration) with 59%

marks from S.V. University, Tirupati, and Master of Library Science (MLiSc) in First Class with 67% of marks. Later, after due selection, he was appointed as Lecturer in Library Science in the 3rd respondent College and joined duty on 12.11.1999. It is stated that the post in which the petitioner was appointed was a grant-in-aid post. However, though the petitioner has been continuing from 1999 onwards, his appointment was not regularised for want of approval of the respondents. It is stated that the 3rd respondent recommended the case of the petitioner for regularisation by proceedings dated 25.04.2001 to the 2nd respondent, and the 2nd respondent in turn recommended the same to the 1st respondent by proceedings dated 22.12.2004. But, the 1st respondent did not pass any orders till date. Hence, the petitioner has come up with the present Writ Petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that one Smt. K. Jhansi Lakshmi, who is a similarly placed employee, filed W.P.No.13395 of 2001 seeking a similar relief, which was disposed of by this Court on 04.07.2001 directing the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner for passing appropriate orders, pursuant to which the 1st respondent issued G.O.Rt.No.862, dated 21.11.2001 regularising her services as Lecturer in Chemistry. Therefore, the learned counsel sought for a similar direction to the respondents in the present Writ Petition also.

4. The learned Government Pleader for Higher Education, on the other hand, stated that the matter is under consideration of the 1st respondent, and hence, sought for disposal of the Writ Petition with appropriate directions.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Higher Education, and considered the material on record.

6. Admittedly, the petitioner was appointed as Lecturer in the 3rd respondent College after due process of selection, having called for applications by issuing a notification. It is also admitted that the petitioner has been working since 1999, and his name was also recommended by the 3rd respondent for regularisation of his services, which was further recommended by the 2nd respondent to the 1st respondent, which is now pending consideration.

7. Therefore, the 1st respondent is directed to consider the said proposal sent by the 2nd respondent expeditiously, preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

8. The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

_____

S.Ananda Reddy, J.

08…08…2005

Kvh

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. ANANDA REDDY

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

W.P. No. 16887 of 2005

O R D E R

08..08..2005

-